

I think that it would be a step backward to put this inflexibility into the new Constitution that we are drafting, and I respectfully request the Committee of the Whole to vote No on the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment? Delegate Fornos.

DELEGATE FORNOS: Is a question in order for the Chairman of the Local Government Committee on this amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me find out first if anyone desires to speak in favor.

DELEGATE FORNOS: It is related to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a second. Delegate Pullen.

DELEGATE PULLEN: Mr. Chairman, I think I can speak in favor of this for the following reasons: I think it would solve all the consequences of the principle and avoid the consequences by denying the principle.

I think we are dealing here with something that supposedly is a local matter when in reality it is a state matter. If a problem is of such consequence that the state legislature has to recognize a different agency, then I think it becomes a function of the State and should be removed from the local government. Therefore, I think that if we are going to set up a new form of government, such as this contemplates, the people ought to have a right to take part in it. I think it transcends the local situation as expressed by the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Moser, do you yield to a question from Delegate Fornos?

DELEGATE MOSER: I yield, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fornos.

DELEGATE FORNOS: Delegate Moser, the two most vivid examples of regional government in North America, I believe, are Dade County and Toronto. Would you not think that those were model regional governments?

DELEGATE MOSER: I would not, say that they are models, Delegate Fornos. Some people call them regional governments, yes.

DELEGATE FORNOS: I think we are playing on words. Both of those metropolitan governments were overwhelmingly

established by the vote of the people who were to be part of the regional government, and they were not rejected when they were placed on the referenda. When Dade County and the City of Miami voted to give up most of the City's municipal rule to the Dade County government, the people of that City voted overwhelmingly for the proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you going to ask a question of Delegate Moser, Delegate Fornos?

DELEGATE FORNOS: Since he chose to make debate out of it, I just retorted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Either ask your question or indicate whether you wish to speak on the question.

DELEGATE FORNOS: I wish to speak in favor of the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me see if anyone desires to speak in opposition. Delegate Clagett.

DELEGATE CLAGETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest in opposition to the amendment that the protection of the boundaries of the counties is preserved in section 7.02, where it specifically provides that no law altering the boundaries of a county shall become effective until submitted to the voters of each county affected and approved by a majority of those voting on the question in each such county. Therefore, the integrity of the boundaries of counties is preserved by that section.

Likewise, with respect to this suggested amendment, I point out to you that with respect to the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, or the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, both multi-county units, a change of the areas of either of those two units would fall within the amendment as suggested by Delegate Sybert, and would have to go through this cumbersome, laborious, time-consuming and completely unnecessary referendum procedure.

I, therefore, suggest to you that as Delegate Moser, our Chairman, has stated, some degree of trust ought to be placed in the General Assembly to provide adequately and properly and it should not be hamstrung or shackled by unnecessary restrictions.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes Delegate Fornos to speak in favor of the amendment.

DELEGATE FORNOS: Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, it disturbs me that there